



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,479	11/20/2001	Todd D. Graham	AELL-110CP 62652-013	1151

7590 09/19/2005

David M. Mello
McDermott, Will & Emery
28 State Street
Boston, MA 02109

EXAMINER

LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,479

Applicant(s)

GRAHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Victor Lesniewski

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

CA

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 7/7/2005 has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claims 1-6 and 9-14 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-16 are now pending.
4. The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the following new grounds of rejection.

Response to Amendment

5. Claims have been amended to show a client module configured to interface to a client operating system kernel and configured to enforce a set of usage rights within the operating system kernel. The amendment proves a change in scope to the independent claims as the independent claims now explicitly state interfacing to the client operating system kernel. However, none of the amended claims show a patentable distinction over the prior art as evidenced by the following new grounds of rejection.
6. Several status identifiers in the amendment have been found to be improper. Please refer to 37 CFR 1.21(c) and submit the proper status identifiers in any future amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,006,332), hereinafter referred to as Rabne, in view of Chan et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,505,300), hereinafter referred to as Chan.

9. Rabne disclosed a system for controlling access to digitized data utilizing a secure rights management server. In an analogous art, Chan disclosed a method for providing restricted execution contexts for untrusted content in a network.

10. Concerning claims 1 and 9, Rabne did not explicitly state a client module configured to interface to a client operating system kernel and configured to enforce a set of usage rights within the operating system kernel. However, allowing a system to enforce access rights in an operating system kernel is well known in the art, as evidenced by Chan whose system uses a security mechanism at the operating system level to determine usage rights for users or processes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Rabne by adding the ability to use a client module configured to interface to a client operating system kernel and configured to enforce a set of usage rights within the operating system kernel as provided by Chan. Here the combination satisfies the need for a system to control and monitor the access and use of restricted content on a network. See Rabne, column 3, lines 32-38.

11. Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same except that they set forth the claimed invention as a method are rejected under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

12. Thereby, the combination of Rabne and Chan discloses:

- <Claims 1 and 9>

A dynamic file access control and management system configured to access one or more content sources including a set of content, said system comprising: A. a proxy system linked to said one or more content sources, said proxy system comprising an access control module configured to selectively obtain content comprising data blocks from said content sources as a function of an authorization of a user requesting said content and a set of access policies (Rabne, column 7, lines 5-9 and column 8, lines 55-67, where the system's digitized data inherently comprises data blocks); B. a rights management module configured to generate a set of usage rights associated with said content as a function of a set of predefined usage policies associated with said content for said user (Rabne, column 8, lines 11-23); C. at least one client device having a client module configured to interface to a client operating system kernel, said client module configured to enforce the set of usage rights within the operating system kernel (Rabne, column 6, lines 31-45 and Chan, column 5, lines 32-55 and column 11, lines 52-62); and D. one or more communication means, via which said content and said usage rights are provided to said client device (Rabne, column 3, lines 52-59).

- <Claims 2 and 10>

The system according to claim 1, wherein said content and said usage rights are provided to said client device via different communication means (Rabne, column 10, lines 34-48).

- <Claims 3 and 11>

The system according to claim 1, wherein said content includes static content (Rabne, column 6, lines 53-60).

- <Claims 4 and 12>

The system according to claim 1, wherein said content includes dynamic content (Rabne, column 6, lines 53-60).

- <Claims 5 and 13>

The system according to claim 1, wherein said communication means includes a secure transform configured to encrypt and encapsulate said content into a message as a function of a session ID and said client is configured to extract said content from said message (Rabne, column 7, lines 10-19).

- <Claims 6 and 14>

The system according to claim 1, wherein said proxy system further includes a user interface, configured to facilitate creation and editing of said access policies and said usage policies and association of said access policies and said usage policies with said content (Rabne, column 18, lines 20-32 and 50-67).

- <Claims 7 and 15>

The system as in claim 1, wherein said client device is a device from a group comprising: 1) a personal computer; 2) a workstation; 3) a personal digital assistant; 4) an e-mail device; 5) a cellular telephone; 6) a Web enabled appliance; and 7) a server (Rabne, column 6, lines 31-45).

- <Claims 8 and 16>

The system of claim 1, wherein said proxy system and at least one of said content sources are hosted on the same computing device (Rabne, figure 1b, item 22).

Art Unit: 2152

Since the combination of Rabne and Chan discloses all of the above limitations, claims 1-16 are rejected.

Conclusion

13. The applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). The applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Victor Lesniewski
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2152



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner